



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

201
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,324	03/27/2004	James T. Henley	7784-000740	8021
27572	7590	06/27/2006		EXAMINER
		HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.		DINH, TIEN QUANG
		P.O. BOX 828		
		BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3644	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/810,324	HENLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Tien Dinh	Art Unit 3644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 10-17 and 37-56 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 10-11, 13-17, 37-40, 44, 45, 51, 52, and 56 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 12,41-43,46-50 and 53-55 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 11, 14-17, 37-40, 44, 51, 52, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels et al in view of Manchester.

Daniels et al teaches an aircraft having fuselage, seating area with seats, a power source, elongated bus strip with a continuous elongated receptacle 17 having an accessible first side and a conductive member 18. Daniels also shows a retaining mechanism 30, 32 and seat track cover (shroud). Please see figure 2. Daniels is silent on the connector that inserts into a receptacle or receptacles without rotation, and the locking details with narrowing passageway. However, Manchester discloses that inserting a connector without rotation into a receptacle and locking details with narrowing passageway (see figure 3 where elements 21 is narrowed near the passageway 19 are well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have used a connector that is “inserted” without rotation into a receptacle that has locking details with narrowing passageway in Daniels et al’s system as taught by Manchester to allow the connector to snugly fit into the receptacle without too much stress and to hold the connector in place.

Re claim 16, please note that these are well known current design. Daniels and Manchester teach all except for the ground. However, grounds are so notoriously well known (see your sockets) that one skilled in the art would use this to have a safer electrical system.

Re claims 44 and 56, please note that the courts have ruled that to make elements integral merely involves routine steps one skilled in the art would have taken to make the system stronger.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels et al as modified by Manchester as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Smallhorn.

Daniels et al as modified by Manchester discloses all claimed parts except for the flush or below floor arrangements. However, Smallhorn discloses that seat tracks and electrical components that are flushed or below the floor are well known.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have made to the bus strip flushed or below the floor in Daniels et al's system as modified by Manchester and taught by Smallhorn to prevent injuries.

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels et al in view of Manchester and Smallhorn.

Daniels et al teaches an aircraft having fuselage, seating area with seats, a power source, elongated bus strip with a continuous elongated receptacle 17 having an accessible first side and a conductive member 18. Daniels also shows a retaining mechanism 30, 32 and seat track cover (shroud). Please see figure 2. Daniels is silent on the connector that inserts into a receptacle or

receptacles without rotation, the flush or below floor arrangements, and the locking details with narrowing passageway. However, Manchester discloses that inserting a connector without rotation into a receptacle and locking details with narrowing passageway (see figure 3 where elements 21 is narrowed near the passageway 19 are well known in the art. Smallhorn discloses that seat tracks and electrical components that are flushed or below the floor are well known.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have used a connector that is “inserted” without rotation into a receptacle that has locking details with narrowing passageway in Daniels et al’s system as taught by Manchester to allow the connector to snugly fit into the receptacle without too much stress and to hold the connector in place.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have made to the bus strip flushed or below the floor in Daniels et al’s system as modified by Manchester and taught by Smallhorn to prevent injuries.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-11, 13-17, 37-40, 44, 45, 51, 52, and 56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12, 41-43, 46-50, and 53-55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Schuite and Gerber teach plugs.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tien Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-6899. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TD

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tui" followed by a stylized surname.